



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Sammlung Englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben. Erster Band: Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar, herausgegeben von Julius Zupitza. Erste Abtheilung: Text und Varianten. Zweiter Band: Thomas of Erceldoune, herausgegeben von Alois Brandl. Dritter Band: The Erl of Tolous and the Emperes of Almayn, herausgegeben von Gustav Lüdtkke.

Again Prof. Zupitza has agreeably surprised his co-laborers with his unannounced appearance of the Sammlung Englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben. Thus far three volumes have appeared, beginning with Ælfric's Grammatik und Glossar edited by Prof. Zupitza himself. The conception of the undertaking, the selection of the opening volume of what we hope will prove a convenient and at the same time critical library of Anglo-Saxon and Old English, could not have been happier, and augurs good for the undertaking. The well-known ability of the editor and his critical acumen bespeak thoroughness and scholarly care in the preparation of this collection. The need of a convenient and at the same time critical edition of this opening work has long been felt, and Prof. Zupitza deserves hearty thanks for coming forward to meet this want. We not only hope that he may continue the good work thus begun, but also that others may be led thereby to imitate his good example, until all of these now almost inaccessible monuments of the oldest literature of our language shall be rendered accessible to all students. When this shall have been accomplished we may reasonably hope that a complete dictionary of this early period will be undertaken, which in its turn will fill up a gap in this department. It is only to be hoped that Ælfred's Beda may follow close upon Ælfric's Grammar, which as well as the grammar has lain long enough in its now inaccessible form, where none but the fortunate few can occasionally consult it.

The Grammar and Glossary of Ælfric opens a repository of precious and rare forms which have long been concealed from us, and which are of inestimable value in a grammatical point of view. Perhaps no other Anglo-Saxon text affords a like treasure of rare grammatical forms, and this edition will therefore be doubly welcome to all students of Old English.

When we look back to Ælfric's time it is easy to see what motives prompted him to attempt a grammar. It will be remembered that the great Dunstan, born perhaps a little earlier than 925 (see Ten Brink's *Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur*, p. 128 and following, for a fuller account of this period), had inaugurated that reform among the monks which was to be a reawakening not only of the religious and inner life of the clergy, but also a revival of learning. Æthelwold, Dunstan's great co-laborer and helper, ordained priest on the same day with him, strove to instruct the clergy and through them the people. Called forth by this spiritual renovation which Dunstan and Æthelwold had begun to awaken first among the monks and then among the people, if not by the

direct influence of these two earnest workers for the reform and education of their age, the Blickling Homilies appeared; these were followed about twenty years later by the homilies of Ælfric. Born 959, the latter had imbibed from his youth the purer atmosphere which Æthelwold had diffused, was educated in his school and had fully entered into the ideas of his great master. He was employed in various church matters, but more especially in the composition of pieces of a moral and religious nature, which, like all writings of this kind at the time, were in the Latin language. But the monks, long disused to the Latin tongue and even ignorant of the grammar of their own language, could with difficulty profit by these writings; and it was to meet this need of his age and to lighten the learning of Latin for beginners that Ælfric determined to make an abstract of Priscian's *Institutiones Grammaticae*, to which he joined an Anglo-Saxon interlinear version. He considered grammar the key which unlocks the meaning of books; and thought it beseeing in every man endowed with talents to use them for the benefit of his fellow-men, and thus increase the pound entrusted to him in order that he might not be called an unprofitable servant (cf. Preface).

Ælfric found in Priscian well-defined technical expressions for the various grammatical relations, but in the dearth of all grammar in his own tongue he met at the very outset of his undertaking with great difficulty in finding not only appropriate and neat, but also intelligible expressions in Anglo-Saxon, so that it is no matter of surprise to see him groping his way in the dark, or even going astray sometimes. In part, however, he employed the Latin technical terms, giving them an Anglo-Saxon dress, and also made use of others already known. Thus we find of the Latin in English dress: *declinian*, *declinung*, g. pl. *casa* for *casuum*, d. pl. *casum* for *casibus*. But Ælfric preferred to give the Latin technical expression by an Anglo-Saxon word and then retain the word throughout, as is the case with *cynn* = *genus*, *word* = *verbum*, *tīd* = *tempus*, *getel* = *numerus*, *hād* = *persona*, *nama* = *nomen*, *āgene naman* = *nomina propria*. Oftener, however, he would give the meaning of the Latin expression when it first appeared and retain the Latin term afterwards. Of course it cannot be expected that at that early period in the development of the language, even a man of Ælfric's acknowledged ability would in every instance make a felicitous and apt choice of expressions to translate the Latin technical terms. One is constantly surprised to see what pains he takes to get as literal a translation as possible, even to the sacrificing of the sense, and this desire often led him to make choice of an inappropriate term. Perhaps it will not be altogether without interest to mention a few. Some of the more fortunate are: *grammatica* = *stāferāft*, *iunctura litterarum* = *stāfgefēg*, *figura* = *hiw*, *primitiva* = *fyrmyste oððe frumcennede* (not so good), *conjugatio* = *gēðeodnys*, *praepositio* = *foresetnys*. Less fortunate are: *primitiva* = *frumcennede*, *relativum* = *ediesendlic*, *relationem* = *edlesunge*, *demonstrativum*, *derivativum* = *ofgangende*, *interjectio* = *betwuxāle-gednys*.

Not often do we find an awkward translation, though Ælfric's wish to be as literal as possible sometimes led him to use awkward expressions. As such we mention his translation of the future passive infinitive by the verbs *faran* and *gangan*, as *vis amatum ire* (probably through carelessness in the transcription for *iri*) = *wylt ðā faran lufjan*; *vis doctum ire* = *wylt ðā gān leornjan*

(p. 134, but p. 151 *wylt ðá gán tæcan*). The supine in *-um* he also translates in the same manner, as *lectum pergit* = *hē gæð rædan*; *bibitum pergo* = *ic gange drincan*. Sometimes his literal translations are misleading, as *twægra ceorla ealdor* for *duumvir*, *preōra ceorla ealdor* for *triumvir*.

He has offered only a few words on the subject of Etymology, nor could it be expected at this early period. I give one specimen in order to show how this subject was treated at that time: *HOMO mann is gecweden fram HUMO, pæt is fram moldan, forȳan ðe seo corðe wæs pæs mannes antimber* (p. 293).

On the whole the defects of the book are not so great as we might have expected. It is not my intention, however, to touch upon all points of interest which the rich material of the book affords, but will simply take up one or two points on the Consonant Declension upon which the forms found here throw some additional light. Of the simple consonant stems we find *bōc* f., *brōc* f., *burg* f., *man* m., and *tang* f. *Bōc* occurs only in the d. sg. *bēc*: *be pisum ðrīm tōddlūm wē āwriton on forewerðre pyssere bēc*, p. 290, but from other sources we can complete its declension. King Ælfred furnishes us the g. sg. in two places: *Ælfred Kuning wæs wealhstōd ðisse bēc*, Boet. Prol., and *From pære dura selfre pesse bēc*, Past. C. 24, 11. The form *bōc* occurs in the g. sg. in *seo gefæstnunge pessere landbōc*, Dipl. Angl. 318 (Knut MXXIII), and in the d. sg. we find *bōc* also only a few years later. But these forms are of no value whatever. The real form of the g. sg. ought to be *bōce*, which is never found (cf. Amer. Journ. of Phil. II 195. Scherer's form *bōce* ZGDS¹ 436 is therefore a mistake). G. sg. *bēc* can only be explained as borrowed from the d. sg. unless we accept the shorter ending *-jas* of the genitive singular in this word, which is not probable on account of the forms *burge*, *gōse*, etc., which the other stems commonly have. The form of the n. ac. pl. *brēc* = *femoralia*, *wædrbrēc* = *perizoniata campēstria* (p. 315), adds nothing new, as this form occurs often. The g. and d. sg. have not yet been found. Ælfric furnishes another proof that the g. sg. of these stems ends in *e* and does not umlaut. We have already (*l. c.*) considered the g. sg. *byrig* as a poetical form taken from the d. sg., because in Ælfred's writings we find only the form *burge*. Ælfric confirms this, as he has p. 29 *hæc Tirus anre burge nama*. Twice we find the d. sg. *burig*, p. 273, 280, which is the regular form expected here. From other sources we have besides this form the forms *burh* and *burge*, on *pære burh*. Blickl. Hom. 197, on *pære burh naht gewinnan*. Lye. Suppl. Sermo. innan *pære burh*. ib. The Durham Ritual has generally the regular form, but once we find the surprising form in *ðam byrig*, p. 196; *ad arcem et ad maenia, tō burge and wealle*, Kent. Gl. in Zs. f. d. a. 21, 24; *þe he bigge ððer sylle æðer oððe burge oððe on wæpengetæce*, AS. Laws ed. by Schmidt, 2. Aufl. 195. The form *burh* may be explained as a case where the vowel *i* has fallen out behind a guttural (cf. this Journ. II 198 ff.) *Burge* will probably have to be explained by the third method of forming the dative singular as explained in this Journal II, pp. 47, 48, 49. *Man* offers the d. sg. *ælcum men*, p. 27, and *pæt sumum men stent ege fram mē*, p. 123. The word *tang* = *forceps*, p. 67, only occurs in the n. sg. Ettm. Wb. 526 gives *tange tangan*, Cot. 81, which would make our word an *n*-stem. The O. N. n. pl. *tengr tangir* indicates an *i*-stem, with which the O. H. G. d. sg. *zangi* coincides.

Of the nouns of relationship only two occur: *brōðor* and *fæder*, in cases which have an interest for us; of these *brōðor* has in the g. sg. *brōðor*, *āres brōðor* =

nostri fratris, d. sg. *brēðer*, *árum brēðer* = *nostro fratri*, *fram árum brēðer* = *a nostro fratre*, and the n. pl. *áre (ge)brōðra* = *nostri fratres*, p. 102: *fæder* is found in the d. sg. in *ic geefenlæce minum fæder = patrisso*, p. 215, and *æfter bebyrgedum fæder*, p. 275. No new forms are offered here, but we see no transition into the *a*-declension, as is often the case with *fæder* in other authors.

Of the present participles we find the ac. pl. *fýnd*: *a se expellunt hostes = hī áðræfað heora find him fram*, p. 110. *Arcesso = ic áflige míne fýnd oððe genyrwige*, p. 166. In the d. sg. we find the form *fýnd*: *adversum-inimicum pergit = tógeānes his fýnd hē gæð*, unless this be the ac. pl. also. But the following examples tend to show that *tógeānes* governs the dative in this sense: *farað him tógeānes*, Sal. 119; *eodon him tógeānes*, An. 45, 657; *hē him tó geānes ráð*, B. 1893. Ettmüller Wb. 423, quotes *tógeānes his frýnd*, Gen. 14, 17, and our passage as examples of *tógeānes* governing the ac. Not having the text at hand it is impossible to say whether in the passage cited from Gen. we have the sing. or plur. and therefore we can come to no conclusion in regard to this passage¹; in the d. sg. in other places we often have this unlauted form, e. g. *and gán tó his frýnd*, Ælf. Hom. I 248, and *pāt pā pīnum frýnd ne helpe*, Deut. 15, 10, which show that this form in the dative was known and used even by Ælfric. In O. H. G. we also find *friunt* in the d. sg. (Ahd. Gl. herausgeg. von Steinmeyer and Sievers, p. 705, 65), instead of the more usual form *friunti*. It is evident that at one time this unlauted form was the prevalent one, which had partially replaced the flexionless form, and was in its place replaced by the form of the *a*-declension. And as we have seen in this Journ. vol. II, 191, that Ælfric and Ælfred always employed the unlauted plurals *fýnd*, *frýnd*, to which we can now add the datives singular *fýnd*, *frýnd*, we may indeed assume the unlauted forms to have been the best authorized ones at one time. That the unlauted forms were the earlier and more correct, i. e. the correct reflex of the Gothic *fijands*, *frijōnds*, and that the unlauted forms *fýnd*, *frýnd* are the result of a transition into the *i*-declension, has already been shown in the article above cited.

In the other declensions we find nothing new and can therefore condense our remarks on this head. The word *might* occurs in the g. sg., *lufigendlicere mihte = amandae virtutis*, p. 152. Sievers, P. B. B. I 495, in his article entitled *Kleine Beiträge zur Deutschen Grammatik*, formulates the rule that "all *i*-stems have the umlaut throughout, have no ending in the n. and ac. sg., and have in the g. pl. only *a*," and p. 499 he further says: "For the older A. S. therefore there is only one clearly-defined distinction between the *ā*- and *i*-stems, viz. in the ac. sg. (*ā*-stems have -e), and not until later did this difference disappear." In his enumeration of those words which have not assumed the form of the *ā*-stems in the ac. sg. we find p. 497 ac. sg. *meaht miht*, and for the older period this was probably the only form. Later, however, we find constantly the form *meahte mihte* in the ac. sg., unless we agree with Sievers in saying that possibly the pl. of these abstract nouns is often used for the singular, which may be true and for which many examples can be produced in proof. And yet when we place the examples of both forms *miht*, *mihte* side by side we are almost led to believe that *mihte* is an ac. sg. and not an ac. pl. We give here a few of the many examples we have found in various authors: *ðurh mihte* (twice) *ðæs halgan gastes*,

¹ Through the kindness of Prof. Child I learn that Ettmüller's quotation is false, as no passage of the kind occurs in Gen.

Ælfred's Beda 445; *Gif ðre godas ænige mihle hæfdon*, ib. 141; and *heo hafað pas mighte*, Leechd. I 290; *ðurh Godes mihte*, ib. III 424; *ðurh his þa mycclan miht*, Blickl. Hom. 17, 33. The form *miht*, *meht* is the predominant one here: *æteowan his mihte and willan* (ac. pl.) ib. 67; *ðurh miht ðres drihtnes*, *ðurh þæs lifigendan Godes miht he bið ofslagen and na ðurh nanes engles mihte*, Lye. Suppl. Sermo; *Cneoris and Cneoris hergað werc ðin and maht þine*, St. Ps. 162, 3. But often *mæhte* also with no perceptible difference of meaning. We also find the plural *mihta*, which in its turn indicates a transition into the *â*-declension. We have already in this Journal II 198 alluded to the fact that the d. sg. often appears in the flexionless form *miht*, which is likewise the case in O. H. G., and explained this fact as the dropping of the vowel *i* behind dentals.

II. Thomas of Erceeldoune, edited by Alois Brandl, is a poem containing the so-called prophecies of Thomas of Erceeldoune. Its historical worth, though not to be entirely discarded by the historian, is of minor importance on account of its inaccuracies. Its chief merit lies therefore in its philological interest in respect of its dialect, and from the fact that the time of its composition can be quite definitely determined by the frequent allusions to contemporary events. The editor has known how to make good use of these, and the discussions of various points of interest relating to the author, time of composition and political allusions will be welcome to all. Great care is shown in the preparation of the work for the press, and it will be found a convenient book of reference for those studying this period.

III. The Erl of Tolous and the Emperes of Almayn: eine Englische Romanze aus dem Anfange des 15 Jahrhunderts nebst litterarischer Untersuchung über ihre Quelle, die ihr verwandten Darstellungen und ihre geschichtliche Grundlage, herausgegeben von Gustav Lüdtke. The present is the first critical edition of this work and an attempt to rescue the English metrical romances from the oblivion in which they have lain so long. Many of these may have no great aesthetical worth, and may therefore not afford very enjoyable reading, but from a historical and philological point of view they throw great light upon the customs and manners of the English people of the middle ages, as also upon their language. Hence the student of history and philology will heartily greet the appearance of this critical edition of a really interesting and enjoyable little poem aside from its historical and philological worth. That time and pains have not been spared to make it in every way acceptable is vouched for by its admission into this series. The introduction contains all that could be wished for a thorough study of the sources, its treatment in different lands, and its historical foundations.

In conclusion we can only hope that the good work thus prosperously inaugurated may go on until this whole field has been explored and all works of worth given to us in handy and critical editions.

S. P.